



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/823,319 | 04/13/2004 | Haruo Ura | NUMAP0102US | 4754 |
| 43076 | 7590 | 06/14/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| MARK D. SARALINO (GENERAL) | | | | PYO, KEVIN K |
| RENNER, OTTO, BOISELLE & SKLAR, LLP | | | | ART UNIT |
| 1621 EUCLID AVENUE, NINETEENTH FLOOR | | | | PAPER NUMBER |
| CLEVELAND, OH 44115-2191 | | | | 2878 |

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| | 10/823,319 | URA ET AL. |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Kevin Pyo | 2878 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 13 April 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/13/04.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____ .

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “optical fiber cable” of claims 3 and 7 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pearson (4,516,853).

Regarding claim 1, Pearson shows in Fig.1 the following elements of applicant's invention: a) a measuring laser beam generating means (110) for outputting a measuring laser beam used to measure a characteristic of an object to be measured; b) an optical guiding means (122) for controlling the direction in which the measuring laser beam travels; c) a measuring means (129) for measuring the property of the object to be measured using the measuring laser beam returning from the object to be measured; d) a position detecting means (200) for detecting the position of an object to be tracked; and e) a control means (127) for controlling the optical guiding means so that the measuring laser beam is radiated to the object to be tracked based on the position of the object to be tracked detected by the position detecting means, wherein the measuring means measures the property of the object to be measured using the measuring laser beam returning from the object to be measured in a state where the measuring laser beam is controlled to be radiated to the object to be measured (col.3, lines 28-32).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearson in view of Kumagai et al (6,734,412).

Regarding claim 2, Pearson differs from the claimed invention in that it does not disclose a laser based position detection device. However, the use of a laser based position detection device is well known in the art as disclosed by Kumagai et al in view of providing a higher degree of accuracy and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace the RF radar (200) of Pearson with a laser based position detecting device of Kumagai et al in view of the desire to detect the position of the object with a higher degree of accuracy.

Regarding claim 3, the use of an optical fiber as means for transferring a light beam in an optical device is well known in the art and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize an optical device between a laser (110) and an optical element (132) in view of preventing any ambient light from interfering with the light beam from the laser.

6. Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearson.

Regarding claims 4 and 5, the device of Pearson utilizes a RF.radar (200) as a position detecting device. However, depending on the design requirements and the desired performance, the specific position detecting device utilized would have been an obvious design choice with the skill of ordinary person in the art depending on the needs of particular application.

Regarding claim 6, the idea of generating a warning light for warning or intimidation in an intruder detection for the purpose of driving an intruder away from a guarded region, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include an intimidating element if the device of Pearson was used to detect an intruder.

Regarding claim 7, the use of an optical fiber as means for transferring a light beam in an optical device is well known in the art and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize an optical device between a laser (110) and an optical element (132) in view of preventing any ambient light from interfering with the light beam from the laser.

7 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Pyo whose telephone number is (571) 272-2445. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (with flexible hour), First Mon. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David P. Porta can be reached on (571) 272-2444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kevin Pyo
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2878